Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—THE ACCUSATIVE PLURAL OF ɪ̯-, ʊ̯-, AND R-STEMS IN SANSKRIT AND AVESTAN.

Some months since, while reading the Yasna Haptanghāiti in Geldner's new edition of the Avesta, I noted the two acc. plur. forms which are now, on the authority of the best MSS, read māteraš (Y. 38, 5) and neraš (Y. 40, 3) with final š, not s, and was struck with the importance of the new reading for determining the Aryan form. Soon after I found that Bartholomae (K. Z. 29, 483) had already made these forms the starting point of an article in which he retracts the explanation which he had once given on the basis of the reading neras (Handbuch der altiranischen Dialekten, §205), and substitutes a new treatment of the acc. plur. of i̯-, u̯-, and r-stems. His theory has awakened the strong hostility of J. Schmidt in Pluralbildung der indogerm. Neutra, and a review of the subject with an attempt at a somewhat different explanation may not be superfluous.

According to Bartholomae, the coincidence of the Sanskrit and Avestan forms proves that the Aryan[1] accusatives plural were -inš, -unš, -r̥ns,[2] and since the intervening nasal would prevent the change of s to š after i, u, and r̥, the š in place of s must be due to analogy. So he thinks that -ins, -uns became -inš, -unš under the influence of the fem. acc. plur. -īš, -ūš after the analogy of ans : ās, and that after this the spread even to the r-stems.

J. Schmidt (Pluralbildung, pg. 273 ff.) denies that the Aryan forms can have been -inš, -unš, not being able to accept Bartholomae's explanation, because (1) the existence of Aryan acc. plur. fem. in -īs, -ūš doubtful, Skt. -īs, -ūs probably new formations masc. -īn, -ūn on the analogy of -ās : -ān ; (2) Skt. girīn, etc., with dental n cannot be derived from an Aryan -inš: "Ehe die nasale vor folgenden zischlauten zu anusvāra wurden, hatten sie die selbe artikulationstelle wie die zischlaute . . . Das beweisen fälle wie dán(s), gen. zu dam-, agan(s) du giengst, avān(st) er verbeugte sich. Ar.*girinsh hätte also girín, nicht girín ergeben." This last objection

[1] It is perhaps scarcely necessary to state that Aryan is used in the sense of the Indo-Iranian branch of the Indo-European family.

[2] In reference to the length of the vowels, cf. the excursus at end.

has been answered, satisfactorily as it seems to me,[1] by Bartholomae himself (Indogermanisch ss, pg. 38), and on the first no very great weight can be laid. But even admitting the justice of J. Schmidt's strictures, as far as they concern Bartholomae's explanation, he is certainly unreasonable in denying the actual existence of Aryan forms with final š. As we shall see, the acceptance of these forms does not necessarily imply that -inš is the direct predecessor of Skt. īn. He admits that the Vedic Sandhi forms in -īṅr, -ūṅr before vowels can be derived only from forms in ž, not z, but considers these a special Skt. formation with transfer of the ž from the fem. The Av. forms in -iš, -ūš he holds to be either

[1] Notwithstanding the retort made (since the above was written) by J. Schmidt in his lectures on Comparative Grammar of Sanskrit. At the close of some observations intended expressly to enlighten "the gentlemen who come from Leipzig" as to his reasons for still writing agni-s, etc., with dental, not lingual final, he reproduces as his best point the argument that an Aryan -inš would give Skt. -iṇ, not -īn, and derisively adds, "Bartholomae will diesen entwand beseitigen, indem er sagt, wir wissen nicht wie früh sich die linguale Artikulation in Sanskrit eingestellt hat. Na, dann ist, überhaupt keiner Streit mehr," implying that Bartholomae was thus receding from his own position that the Aryan form had š, not s. Such an implication can have force only for one who is laboring under a delusion referred to by Sievers (Grundzüge der Phonetik[3], pg. 122) as follows: "Hier gibt es vor allen Dingen den aus der Sanskrit-grammatik bei vielen Sprachforschern eingewurzelten Irrthum zu beseitigen, als sei 'cerebrales s' ohne weiteres identisch mit š, oder 'palatales s' mit skr. ç, d. h. als verhielten sich die drei Laute š, ç, s so zu einander wie die skr. verschlusslaute ṭ, c, t. Vielmehr existiren vollkommen ausgebildete Parallelreihen von s- und š- Lauten, d. h. es giebt sowohl cerebrale, palatale als dentale s und š." The old transcription of the Skt. sound in question, and still used by J. Schmidt, namely, sh, emphasizes the fact that it is an sh-sound, Whitney's transcription, which I have followed in this paper, ṣ, the fact that it is a lingual sound. While either of these is for practical use better than a more complicated designation, the only strictly correct transcription is that used by Brugmann in his Grundriss, ṣ̌, which makes apparent both the important factors in the sound, and if J. Schmidt, who derides all new-fangled transcriptions, had at least understood this particular one, he would not have made such short work of Bartholomae's argument. The change s after i, u, ṛ, r to š, which Bartholomae, Brugmann and others place in the Aryan period was a change to a simple sh-sound (š) and the lingual quality which the sound has in Skt. is a special Skt. development. Š would not have power to change n to ṇ until it had itself become ṣ̌, and īn might have arisen from inš before š had become ṣ̌. So I fail to see anything ridiculous in Bartholomae's argument, though I do not myself explain īn as from inš.

directly derived from -ins, or "what is more probable" with š after the analogy of the fem. So he considers the š (ž) in both cases due to the same analogy, but working independently in Skt. and Av. Such a coincidence would be singular, though not absolutely inconceivable, but the forms of the r-stems, which J. Schmidt passes over in silence, add new difficulties to such an hypothesis. Bartholomae has called attention to the identity of Av. neraš (monosyllabic, a merely indicating the nasality of the r; cf. his Handbuch, §205) and Skt. nṝ́r a- (Rig-Veda, V 54, 15), and to the latter form we may add nṝ́ṇṣ p- quoted by Whitney (Skt. Gram.[2] §209 b) from the Māitrāyaṇī Saṁhita. How would J. Schmidt account for the presence of the ṣ in Skt., and š in Av.? The Skt. ṣ he might explain as due to the analogy of the fem. forms matṛ́ṣ, svásṝṣ, in case these forms are not of comparatively late origin, as Bartholomae holds them to be; but for Avestan such an explanation is impossible, for no fem. forms corresponding to Skt. matṛ́ṣ exist. We have only materaš (Yasna, 38, 5) = Skt. mātṛ́n (Rig-Veda, X 35), and mātarō, which is nom., not acc., in form.

Or are š and ṣ due to the analogy of the masculines -īš, -ūš and -īṇṣ, -ūṇṣ after they themselves had received their š and ṣ from the analogy of the feminines? That such a complicated series of analogies should have worked *independently* in both Skt. and Av. is too much to believe. The only rational theory is that already in the Aryan period masc. forms with final š existed.

Now to the main point for the consideration of which this paper is written. Is it necessary to suppose, with Bartholomae, that the š of Aryan inš, etc., is due to analogy? His point is of course that the law by which s after i, u, and ṛ became š had its period of activity in Aryan times, whereas the reduction of the nasal (which would prevent the affection of s by preceding i, etc.) before spirants belongs to the independent development of Skt. and Av., as is shown by the fact that the reduction takes place not merely in words in which the spirant is common to both languages, and therefore Aryan, but also where it is of specific Skt. or Av. origin (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I, §199, note; in havíṇṣi, áyūṇṣi there mentioned the ṣ is due to analogy of other cases, such as havísām, where it is regular. But is it so certain that the affection of nasals before spirants in general and that observed in the endings -āns, -īnš, -ūnš, are one and the same phenomenon? An argument for their separation in Skt. may be

found in the fact that those Prātiçākhyas which distinguish anusvāra and anunāsika note especially these acc. plur. forms as having nasalized vowel, not anusvāra; cf. Rig-Veda Prātiçākhya, 795, where is mentioned the *fault* of pronouncing anusvāra instead of anunāsika in certain Sandhi forms, which forms are found by reference to other rules to be exactly our accusatives plural. To be sure certain discrepancies in these authorities, added to the fact that the Atharva-Veda Prātiçākhya knows only nasalized vowels, has made Whitney skeptical as to any genuine distinction (cf his discussion with Bergaigne in Mém. de soc. ling. II, and Skt. Grammar.[2] pgs. 24, 25). But it is hard to believe that such unequivocal statements as the one just referred to are absolutely without foundation, made out of whole cloth. There must have been a real difference in the pronunciation at least in certain dialects and at a certain time,[1] and it is much easier to suppose that this was an original distinction, preserved at the time of the Prātiçākhyas in some dialects, though lost even at this early period in others (as for example that from which the observations in the Atharva Prātiçākhya were made), than that *vice versa* what was originally the same sound became in certain dialects two different sounds. What hinders us from supposing that in the Aryan period long vowels + nasal + s in final syllables became long nasalized vowels + s, while to the special development of Skt. and Av. belongs the more general reduction of nasals before spirants? The reduction of vowel + nasal to nasalized vowel is, of course, a very gradual one, and it was some intermediate stage in this second and later affection of nasals which was noted and described by the Skt. grammarians under the name of anusvāra. The precise physiological nature of this sound need not concern us here, suffice it to say that it was still sufficiently remote from the objective point of its development (simple nasalized vowel, its present value) to be distinguished from the anunāsika, which, according to my hypothesis, was already a simple nasalized vowel in the Aryan period. The fact that the anusvāra reached its objective point and so became identical with the anunāsika in some districts earlier than in others ought to be sufficient to account for their non-distinction in the Atharva Prātiçākhyas and the discrepancies in the details given by the other authorities.

[1] This view is taken by J. Schmidt in his lectures, who finds further supports for it in the fact that many MSS use different signs for anusvāra (·) and anunāsika (◡).

Another proof that the reduction of nasals after long vowels in final syllables should be treated by itself is furnished by the following fact. The contrast of forms like dann iva (Rig-Veda, I 149, dan(n) from dans, gen. of dam) and devāṅ̇ iva shows that the simplification of two or more final consonants is *older* than the reduction of the nasal in the combination—short vowel + nasal + s, but *later* than that in the combination—long vowel + nasal + s. So Brugmann says, "Es scheint daraus zu folgen, dass n vor nicht satzschliessendem -s früher als sonst mit dem vorausgehenden Vocal zu Nasalvocal geworden war" (Grundriss, I, pg. 496; as to the reservation which he adds in reference to the uncertainty of the antiquity of the long vowels in these cases, cf. the excursus).

Now arises the following question. If the Aryan forms of acc. plur. masc. were -ą̄s, -i̯š, -u̯š, whence the full nasal in the common Skt. forms -ān, -īn, -ūn? To think of a restoration of the nasal from the nasalized vowel would be futile. The explanation is that the Vedic doublets -aṅ̇ — -ān, -iṅ̇r — -īn, -uṅ̇r — -ūn, reflect an Aryan, not special Skt., rule of Sandhi; -āns, -īns, -ūns became in the Aryan period -ān, -īn, -ūn as absolute finals, but -ą̄s, -i̯š, -u̯š in Sandhi. In the Indian branch of the family, the forms in -ān had even in Vedic times enlarged their sphere, and in classical Skt. they attained the complete supremacy. In Av. the difference is clearly preserved in the a-declension, though the representative of -ą̄s is found only in the closest combinations, as with a following enclitic particle. So we have in the Gāthas -ę̄ (written -ēng) almost always with -ēn as variant = Aryan -ān, but -ąs-ca = Aryan -ą̄s, in the later Av. -ą (also written -ąn, -ąm), but -ąs-ca.[1] Bartholomae (cf. Handbuch, §46) considers this -ēng of the Gāthas as the representative of Aryan -ans (as he would write it now instead of -ąs) in accordance with his idea of the form of the acc. plur. in Aryan, but he elsewhere (Handbuch, §47) gives examples of ēng = Aryan -ān. In the i̯- and u̯-declensions the Sandhi forms -i̯s, -u̯š won the upper hand and we find -īš, -ūš in both the Gāthas and later Avesta. It is probable that the entire loss of the nasal is merely orthographical (cf. Bartholomae, K. Z. 29, pg. 455). We might see the representatives of Aryan -īn, -ūn in a few forms ending in i and u

[1] For the sake of uniformity we might be tempted to set up -ēngs (-ę̄s) as the proper Gātha form before enclitics, on the basis of yēngs-tu (Y. 46, 14), but as this form stands alone in the Gāthas against at least half-a-dozen in -ąs-ca, it is perhaps better, with Bartholomae, to explain yēngs-tu as arisen under the influence of yēng.

which were formerly taken as acc. plur., but they are altogether uncertain (cf. Bartholomae, K. Z. 29, pg. 456).

Excursus.—On the vowel length in the acc. plur. forms.

Both J. Schmidt and Bartholomae write the Aryan forms with short vowel, -ans, etc., and consider the long vowels of Skt. -ān, -īn, -ūn as a specific Skt. development, but neither gives any satisfactory explanation of the lengthening. J. Schmidt (in his lectures) states as a rule, "Auslautendes -ns dehnt vorhergehenden Vocal und dann geht s verloren," and gives forms like áçvān as examples. Why then do we not have a dắn from dans and ágān from ágans? Bartholomae (Indogerm. ss, pg. 37, foot-note), recognizing the impossibility of bringing the lengthening under any phonetic law, resorts to the principle of analogy. According to him, -ān borrowed its ā from the nom. plur. in -ās, and then after the analogy of devắn, etc., the long vowels were introduced into the i̯- and u̯-declensions. But what compels us to consider the long vowels as special Skt., or in other words what prevents us from considering that the Indo-Eur. forms were -ōns, -īns, -ūns? The fact that the Greek forms can be derived as well from -ōns, -īns, -ūns as from -ons, etc., is acknowledged (cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gram.[2], pg. 125), and it remains to run through the other branches of the Indo-Eur. family and discover if any one of them possesses forms which necessarily presuppose the existence of Indo-Eur. -ons, etc., with short vowel.[1] First to finish with the Aryan branch. From the Av. forms no conclusion as to the original length of the vowels can be drawn. For the ēng of the Gāthas can represent an original long vowel as well as a short, and the sign which is transcribed ą (Justi ã) is used for both long and short vowels (cf. Bartholomae, Handbuch, §§14, 32). In the i̯- and u̯-declensions the best MSS usually read -īš, -ūš, but there are nearly always variants in -iš, -uš, so that I will not claim anything more than that they *can* be derived from forms with long vowels. But the Old Persian acc. plur. forms in ā (martiyā, 'men,' hamaranā, 'battles,' etc.) not only *can*, but apparently *must* be derived from Aryan -ān(s). True, an Aryan final a is represented in the Old Persian inscriptions by ā (whether or not

[1] Hannsen, K. Z. 27, p. 615, note, has already expressed himself in favor of Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc. So too Bremer, Berlin. Phil. Wochenschrift, 1887, p. 502, note, implies the same opinion, inasmuch as he mentions τονς = Skt. tān in the same category with ἵπποις = Skt. áçvāiṣ.)

the lengthening is merely orthographical does not concern us here), but an Aryan final a + cons. is not written long; cf. udapatatā, 3d sing. imperf. mid. = Skt. udápatata, but abara = Skt. ábharat or ábharan, atarsa = Skt. átrasat, etc. (cf. Bartholomae, Handbuch, §35; Spiegel, Die altpersische Keilinschriften², pg. 188). So an Aryan an(s) would give a, not ā, and martiyā, etc., can be derived only from forms with long vowel.[1]

In Armenian, mards 'men' (o-stem), sirts 'hearts' (i̯-stem), zards 'adornments' (u-stem), s is the representative of -ns, the vowels having dropped out. But long as well as short vowels in final syllables are regularly dropped in Armenian (cf. Hübschmann, Armenische Studien, I, pg. 57), so that nothing speaks against the supposition of Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc.

Returning to Europe, let us consider the forms offered by Latin and the other dialects of Italy. The long vowels of Lat. equōs, trīs, and fructūs are explained as the result of compensative lengthening after the loss of the nasal in -ons, etc., but -ons, etc., may stand for Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc., for in Lat. we have the same law as in Greek; long vowels are shortened before i̯, u, liquids and *nasals* + mute or spirant (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I, §612). From Umbrian poplof, popluf, in which f is for ns, as regularly in Umbrian, the length of the vowel cannot be determined. In the nom. plur. poplos, poplur the o and u denote long vowels, and so they may in poplof, popluf. The same is true of the forms of the i̯- and u̯-declension, trif 'tres,' kastruvuf 'fundos.' So also in Oscan feíhoss 'fines,' leígoss 'milites delectos,' teremniss 'terminos' (if acc., not, as Bücheler thinks, abl. =terminibus), the quantity of the vowel is uncertain.

Old Irish firu 'men,' fāthi 'poets,' gnīmu 'actions,' are to be immediately derived from forms in -ōs, -īs, -ūs, since a short vowel would have disappeared completely, and that the long vowels are the result of compensative lengthening is merely possible, not necessary; -ōns could have resulted in nothing but -ōs.

The Gothic forms like dagans 'days,' gastins 'guests,' sununs 'sons' show short vowels and, as is shown by the a of dagans, these must have been short even in prehistoric Teutonic, but we have to reckon with the possibility that in the earliest period of separate Teutonic development a law was active similar to that which worked in Greek and Latin, namely, 'long vowels are shortened

[1] Of course we have to reckon with the possibility that these are nominative forms used accusatively, but if they are genuine accusatives, which we have no reason to doubt, they prove an Aryan -ān(s).

before i̯, u̯, liquids and nasals + mute or spirant.' At least before n + mute or spirant, the only case which concerns our theory, such a shortening is made probable by Gothic vinds, Anglo-Saxon wind, as related to Skt. vānt-, pres. pple. of √vā 'to blow' (cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I, §614).

The acc. plur. forms in the Baltic and Slavic families have always been derived from -ons, etc., but if, as Brugmann (Grundriss, I, §615) holds, original long vowels were shortened before i̯ or nasal + mute or spirant, -ons might very well stand for Indo-Eur. -ōns. There seem, however, to be some elements of uncertainty in this law, though a few forms, especially the acc. plur. of the ā stems in Lithuanian and Old Bulgarian, have as yet found no other explanation. It may therefore be worth the while to show that the Baltic and Slavic forms in question may be derived *directly* from Indo-Eur. -ōns, -īns, -ūns. The stages in the development of the Old Bulgarian forms as given by Leskien in his lectures (cf. also his Handbuch d. altbulg. Sprache, pg. 19, slightly different in the treatment of the o-stems) are as follows:

1	2				
ons ...	ōns ...	ōn ...	ūn ... y	*e. g.*	toky 'streams.'
uns ...	ūns	...	ūn ... y	*e. g.*	syny 'sons.'
ins ...	īns	...	īn ... i	*e. g.*	nošti 'nights.'

From this see that with the supposition of Indo-Eur. -ōns, etc., we are one step nearer the actual Old Bulgarian forms. For the -ę of the i̯o-stems, as in konję 'horses,' he gives the following development: -jons, -jèns, -jēns, -jēn, -ję. An Indo-Eur. -ōns would save one stage, for we should have jōns, jēns, jēn, ję.

We turn now to the Baltic family where matters are more complicated. In the Old Prussian forms in -ans and -ins the vowels may be long, since long and short vowels are not usually distinguished, and then they would be the regular representatives of Indo-Eur. -ōns, -īns, Prussian ā being = Indo-Eur. ō. In Lithuanian the forms of the i̯ and u̯ declensions, like akìs 'eyes,' dangùs 'heavens,' may be from Indo-Eur. -īns, -ūns, since long vowels are shortened in final syllables with "gestossenen" accent (cf. Leskien, Archiv für slavische Philologie, V 188). The acc. plur. of the o-stems ends in -ùs (-ű́s-jos in definite adjective), and it is usual to derive this from an older -ans = Indo-Eur. -ons. But such a change of an to u, common enough in Lettic, would be isolated in Lithuanian, and, moreover, the acc. plur. fem. forms of adjectives, such as pirmàs, 'first,' definite adjective pirmás-es, compared with pirmans-es, which is found frequently in Old

Lithuanian texts (sixteenth century) actually show that -ans does not give -us, -ů̃s-, but -as, -ás-. Now wherever else in Lithuanian we find an u in final syllable with "gestossenen" accent beside an ů in non-final syllable, it is always derived from Indo-Eur. ō. So, for example, in nom. acc. dual of o-stems we have dëvù 'two gods,' but in the definite adjective, in which the second element was added so long ago that the last syllable of the adjective proper is not to be considered a final, jaunů̃-ju, and here, of course, ù, ů̃- are from Indo-Eur. ō; cf. Gr. ἵππω. In the same way may our acc. plur. forms, as dëvùs, in def. adj. jaunů̃s-jus, be derived from Indo-Eur. -ōns. So in Lettic grékus 'sins' the u is from ů by the law, "In every final syllable a long vowel becomes short, a diphthong a monophthong," and Lett. ů = Lith. ů = Indo-Eur. ō. The ů is preserved in monosyllabic words, which are exempt from the working of the above rule. So tōs, jōs etc., o after Bielenstein to represent the ů with "gedehnten" accent. In náktis 'nights,' etc., of the i-declension, the i is shortened from ī by the law of final syllables quoted above. There are no plur. forms of u-stems in Lettic.

We have now completed our survey of the various branches of the Indo-Eur. family (Albanian has no forms which have any bearing on the question in hand) *and have found no forms which cannot, without the violation of any known phonetic law, be derived from -ōns, -īns, -ūns, whereas in Sanskrit, Old Persian, and Lithuanian exist forms which cannot be "laut-gesetzlich" derived from -ons, -ins, -uns.* There ought to be no objection to admitting -ōns, etc., as Indo-Eur. on the ground that the origin of such forms is more difficult to explain. Our knowledge of the original formation of cases is too small for us to allow it to have any influence on our determination of the forms which actually existed at the period just preceding the breaking up into the various families.

BERLIN, *June* 18, 1890.

Since the above was written the new volume of Brugmann's Grundriss, which treats of declension, has appeared, and in this I see that some of my results have been anticipated. Brugmann also has concluded that the š of Aryan -īnš, etc., is not due to analogy, but arose phonetically owing to an earlier reduction of nasals after long vowels. The fact that he has reached this result without the aid of what was to me the chief argument, namely, the distinction between anunāsika and anusvāra, may in itself help to prove that this argument is correct. Perhaps the chief reason of

Whitney's scepticism as to any real distinction (aside from his well-founded distrust of the Hindu grammarians on general principles) lay in the fact that there was apparently no raison d'être for any such distinction. In Mém. de la soc. ling. II, pg. 197, he says in regard to our attitude toward the statements of the Rig-Veda Prātiçākhya, "Un pas important serait de déterminer s'il est dans la nature de la chose une raison quelconque pour que le peu de cas dans lesquelles la voyelle nasale est admise produisent une altération différente du reste. Je n'aborde point cette discussion, me bornant à observer que je ne puis voir aucun motif de faire une telle distinction."

But now we have a reason. Those few cases in which the nasalized vowel is admitted are exactly the ones in which the nasal suffered an earlier reduction than elsewhere. To illustrate my idea of the process I take the acc. plur. form of aṅsa, "shoulder," using ą̣ to denote the nasalized vowel, and a^n for an intermediate stage between an and ą̣, a stage in which the nasal still preserved something of its quality as an independent element.

I.	$ansā^n$s in Sandhi,		ansān as absolute final.	
II.	a^nsą̣s	"	a^nsān	" "
III.	ą̣są̣s	"	ą̣sān	" "

The statements of the Rig-Veda Prātiçākhya are in agreement with II, those of the Atharva-Veda Prātiçākhya with III, in which the nasal had become as thoroughly merged with the vowel in the first syllable as in the second and, there no longer existed any genuine distinction between anunāsika and anusvāra.

In regard to the vowel length, Brugmann leaves it an open question whether the endings were -ons, etc., or -ōns, etc., but gives the forms with short vowels the preference. He has anticipated me in rejecting the usual derivation of Lithuanian -ùs-, ũs- from -ăns = Indo-Eur. -ons, but says it is equally impossible to derive it from -ōns since this would also have become -ăns. He therefore explains the ů as a transfer from the loc. plur. in -ůsu, -ůse, but even here the ů is not original, but, according to Brugmann, due to proportional analogy with ā-stems. Further, this newly created -ůns reacted on the locative and gave rise to the nasal in the dialectic vilkunse. This explanation has nothing improbable in it and, though complicated, seems the only possible one, if -ōns would, as Brugmann holds, have resulted in -ăns. But this point does not seem to me to be definitely settled. That long vowels were shortened in Baltic before i̯ + cons. can scarcely be

denied in face of vilkaīs = Skt. vṛkāiṣ, Indo-Eur. -ōis, but that this shortening also took place before nasal + cons. is, I think, not strictly proved. Osthoff (M. V. II, pg. 129) set up the law, "ā wird in der stellung vor sonorlaut in derselben Silbe verkürzt," but some of the forms which are used to prove this are sufficiently explained by Leskien's law, which had not been discovered at that time. In Geschichte d. Perfect, pg. 85, he thinks the law is possibly to be amended to "langer vocal vor einem sonorlaut und hinterher folgenden geräuschlaute ging in die entsprechende kürze über," and this is essentially the form in which it appears in Brugmann's Grundriss (I §615). The forms which are there given as coming under this law are (as far as nasal + cons. is concerned): (1) gerunds of denominative verbs as jḗszkant from -ōnt; (2) acc. plur. of ā-stems. As for the acc. plur. forms Prof. Brugmann, who has had the kindness to look through the proofs of the above article, informs me that he now no longer considers these as examples of this law. The nouns never had a nasal, as is shown by the fact that the dialects which preserve a nasal show no trace of one in this case (cf. Grundriss II, §327), and the case of pirmans-es is involved in so many uncertainties that it can hardly be used for or against the law. So the case rests simply on gerunds of the type of jḗszkant, and these at least *admit* of another explanation, namely, that they are formed after the analogy of simple thematic verbs. Osthoff (M. V. II, pg. 130), to be sure, thinks this improbable, inasmuch as the i-verbs show no such influence; cf. mýlint, but the *possibility* of such an explanation can scarcely be denied. A phonetic law which is not strictly proved may be judged by its fruits, that is, we should weigh that which it explains against that the explanation of which it makes more difficult. The law in point explains jeszkant, but makes the explanation of Lith. -ů̃s less simple, and forces us to separate Lith. -us from Old Prussian -ans in one or two other cases. If we deny the law we make jḗszkant difficult, but explain -ů̃s-, -ùs as regular forms. In this case we should consider these the source of the -ů̃- in the locative ending, instead of vice versa, as Brugmann, who is obliged to suppose two processes of analogy as explained above. Moreover, if we deny the law we are not forced to separate the Lith. dat. plur. ending -mus from the Old Prussian -mans. I would not, however, lay much stress on this point, for the forms of this ending in Balto-Slavic are in such a tangle that it is only a small gain to bring any two of them under one head.

CARL D. BUCK.

LEIPZIG, *Oct.* 22, 1890.